REMARKS

In summary, claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-24, 26, 27, and 29-48 are pending. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-24, 26, 27, and 29-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Claims 1,3,11,13,20,21, 27, 32, 33, 36, 37,40, 42, 45 and 46 are hereby amended. No new matter is added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-24, 26, 27, and 29-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Colossi et al, "Relational extensions for OLAP," IBM Systems Journal, Vol. 41, No 4, 2002 pages 714- 731, hereinafter Colossi.

Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly describe the invention, and respectfully submits that the invention as now more clearly described, is not found, discussed, or taught in the Colossi reference.

Drawing the Examiner's attention to the assigning step and the defining relationships steps, Applicant submits that neither step is found in the Colossi reference. No recitation is found in the Colossi reference of defining additional relationships not found or limited in the database. The relationships identified in Colossi show different views of the data already present within the database, whether a relational database or otherwise. Further, Collosi Fig 6, limits and identifies that the attributes, joins, attribute relationships, and hierarchies sit in the base layer of the categorization of the Collosi data model. As stated on Collosi Page 724, the base layer provides base infrastructure to other objects and encapsulates important concepts of the relational database. As such, each of the relations as described is fixed in the database. This is different than the present invention.

The present invention defines relationships between attributes where the relationships are not subject to restrictions placed on the original database, therefore the data model so created can be more robust than the prior data models allowing more immediate views of the data (since additional hierarchies do not necessarily cost client processing time), while at the same time increasing the response time to designers and users of the data processing system.

The invention additionally assists a creative database designer in the shrinking of the data model and transforming the model data set in ways unavailable to the original database having the restrictions.

As no such assigning of attributes to columns of the database so defined and broadening or changing the relationships between the attributes, then the relationships are not subject to the restrictions placed on the database found in the Collosi reference, Applicant respectfully requests the claim rejections to Collosi be withdrawn. The dependant claims are allowable over Collosi for these reasons.

Separately, claims 3, 13, 21, 33, 42, have been amended to better define the aspect of the invention in which a hierarchy is defined. The amended claims now includes the limitation that the one (or at least one) hierarchy defined, has at least one of the attributes included in the new relationship defined (that is, the relationship so defined not subject to the restrictions placed on the database). In none of the Examiner cited sections, or anywhere in the Collosi reference, is there any description of such a claimed hierarchy defined. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection over claims 3, 13, 21, 33, 42, as anticipated by Collosi, be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-24, 26, 27, and 29-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tuzhilin et al, US Publication No. 2004/0103092, hereinafter Tuzhilin.

Applicant's description of the invention is recited above. Applicant submits that Tuzhilin does not recite or show use of a database having restrictions on its data, or the assigning step associated to such an un-shown restricted database, nor description of the defining step with particularly and now claimed relationships unlimited (and therefore broader and more expansive) by the restrictions on the database. No showing of any restrictions on the database, nor teaching of defining the relationships between the attributes, from the perspective of the database user's needs, without being hindered by database restrictions, is apparent in Tuzhilin. No teaching of the problem, solution, or even evidence

of how to enlarge the population of the data model, without serious additional computational overhead is shown or described in the Tuzhilin reference.

Separately, claims 3, 13, 21, 33, and 42 have been amended to better define the aspect of the invention in which a hierarchy is defined. The amended claims now includes the limitation that the one (or at least one) hierarchy defined, has at least one of the attributes included in the new relationship defined (that is, the relationship so defined not subject to the restrictions placed on the database). In none of the Examiner cited sections, or anywhere in the Tuzhilin reference, is there any description of such now claimed hierarchy.

Applicant respectfully requests the claim rejections to Tuzhilin be withdrawn. The dependant claims are allowable over Tuzhilin for the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is requested that the forgoing arguments, remarks, and amendments be entered, and in view thereof, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow this application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: June 5, 2007

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439